**HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL**

Chapter VIII, Rule 32 (2) (b)
Description of Case

Civil Revision No. 32 of 2006

Date of Decision : 25th May, 2006

A.F.R. (Approved for Reporting)
————————————————
Not Approved for Reporting

Date:- 25/5/2006 Initials of Judge

Note: Bench Reader will attach this at the top of first page of the judgment when it is put up before the Judge for signature.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL**

**Civil Revision No. 32 of 2006**

Mangat Singh
S/o Dalveer Singh
R/o Village Gidhor
Police Station – Nanakmatta
District – Udham Singh Nagar ...Revisionist

**Versus**

1. Judge Family Court, Udham Singh Nagar

2. Gurmit Kaur D/o Santok Singh
W/o Mangat Singh
R/o Sidda Bal Khera,
Police station – Nanakmatta
District – Udham Singh Nagar ....Respondents

Sri Rajeev Sharma, learned counsel for the revisionist
Sri Amit Bhatt and Sri Shohail Ahmed Siddique, learned A.G.A. for the State.

**Hon'ble J.C.S.Rawat, J.**

This is a civil revision against the judgment and order dated 06.05.2006 passed by the learned Jude, Family Court Udham Singh Nagar in Case No. 143 of 2006, Mangal Singh Vs. Gurmit Kaur by which the learned judge directed the revisionist to pay a sum of Rs. 2000/- as expenses of the proceedings to the respondent No. 2.

It is admitted to the parties that the revisionist was married to the respondent No.2 in the year 1985. It is admitted to the parties that the proceedings in matrimonial suit are pending before the trial court. The trial court has not awarded any amount for the maintenance during the pendency of the said suit. The trial court had only awarded a sum of Rs. 2000/- for the litigation expenses to be paid to the respondent No. 2. The trial court had rightly held that the wife require a sum of Rs. 2000/- for the litigation expenses. I do not find any illegality in the order.

In view of the above, I do not find any ground for the inference in the matter. The revision is devoid of merit is liable to be dismissed and the same is accordingly dismissed in limine.

All applications pending in this case are stand disposed of in terms of the judgment.

**(J.S.C.Rawat, J.)**

25th May, 2006
Shiv